

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4 – 9, 11 – 13, and 15 – 24 were pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 4 – 9, 11 – 13, and 15 – 24 have been canceled. Claims 25 – 44 have been added. Claims 25 – 44 remain pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (U.S. Patent 6,564,219, hereinafter ‘Lee’) in view of Amatsu et al. (U.S. Patent 5,471,615, hereinafter ‘Amatsu’). Claims 6, 7, 9, 11 – 13, and 15 – 24 were rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Amatsu et al. (U.S. Patent 5,471,615, hereinafter ‘Amatsu’) and further in view of Field et al. (U.S. Patent 6,253,324, hereinafter ‘Field’). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. However, in view of the cancellation of claims 1, 2, 4 – 9, 11 – 13, and 15 – 24, these rejections are believed to be moot.

New independent claim 25 recites a method comprising, in part, “generating, from the first storage environment, a request to access the at least a portion of the data of the storage object, wherein the request includes the configuration identifier; in response to said request to access, receiving a notification at the first storage environment of a change of location of the at least a portion of the data if the physical storage location of the at least a portion of the data has changed;” and “in response to said notification, generating a new mapping at the first storage environment, wherein the new mapping indicates that the at least a portion of the data is located at a second physical storage location”. Support for claim 25 is found at least on page 11, lines 7 – 15, page 12 line 28 – page 13 line 4, and page 16, lines 1 – 12 of the specification.

Applicants can find no teaching or suggestion of the combination of limitations recited in claim 1 in Lee, Amatsu or Field, taken either singly or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants believe that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the art cited by the Examiner.

New independent claims 32 and 38 each recite a combination of limitations using language similar to that of claim 1, and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over the art cited by the Examiner for similar reasons.

Applicants also assert that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5760-16900/BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin
Reg. No. 33,929
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: 8-22-05